

(242–245) Proposals on descriptive names

Takashi Nakada

Systems Biology Program, Graduate School of Media and Governance, Keio University, Fujisawa 252-0882, Japan; Institute for Advanced Biosciences, Keio University, Kakuganji, Tsuruoka 997-0052, Japan; naktak@ttck.keio.ac.jp

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/653.27>

According to Art. 16.1(b) of the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154. 2012), descriptive names “may be used unchanged at different ranks”. However, when a descriptive name is used at a rank different from that at which it was first validly published, it is not clear whether or not it is a name at new rank as defined in Art. 6.10. To clarify this point, I submit the following proposals.

(242) Add a new Note after Art. 6.10:

“*Note 2bis.* A descriptive name used at a rank different from that at which it was first validly published is not a name at new rank because descriptive names may be used unchanged at different ranks (see Art. 16.1(b)).”

(243) Amend the end of Art. 16.1 as follows (new text in bold):

“[...] or *(b)* descriptive names, not so formed, which may be used unchanged at different ranks (see also Art. 6 Note 2bis).”

(244) Add a new Note after Art. 46 Ex. 11:

“*Note 1bis.* The authorship of a descriptive name (Art. 16.1(b)) is not changed if the name is used at a rank different from that at which it was first validly published because it is not a name at new rank (see Art. 6 Note 2bis; see also Art. 49.2).”

(245) Add a new Example after Art. 46 Note 1bis:

“*Ex. 11bis. Streptophyta* Caval.-Sm. (in Lewin, *Origins of Plastids*: 340. 1993) was originally published as a name at the rank of infrakingdom (used as a rank between subkingdom and phylum). When the name is used at the rank of phylum, it is still cited as *Streptophyta* Caval.-Sm. (1993).”

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to J.H. Wiersema for comments on these proposals.